

In my State of New Mexico, Federal health centers serve 156,000 patients each year. My State has 56 clinics in 27 of the State's 33 counties. Many of the States in this country that are rural probably have a similar percentage.

In most areas these clinics are the sole providers of health care in the county. These clinics are usually also the only providers with a sliding fee scale, which means they provide both geographic and economic access to health care for many uninsured or geographically isolated New Mexicans.

Although they serve much smaller populations, community health centers for migrant populations, the homeless and public housing residents, provide necessary services to many medically underserved populations.

Last year a network of 122 migrant health centers across the country provided basic health care services to 600,000 migrant and seasonal farm workers. Mr. Speaker, this a good bill. It should be reauthorized. I invite cosponsors to the Kassebaum-Richardson bill.

UNITED STATES MUST BE CLEAR ABOUT ITS POSITION REGARDING DEMOCRACY IN TAIWAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the preceding speaker's remarks concerning the events now taking place in the Taiwan Strait. It is very, very important that this Congress is treating this issue today on the floor. It is very, very important that the United States of America make clear to the People's Republic of China that a war of aggression waged against the democracy on Taiwan will not be accepted, not by the United States, not by the free world, and that is the world that Taiwan is joining, because right now, in the days ahead, Taiwan is preparing for the first ever free, fair, open, and democratic elections of a head of government in nearly 5,000 years of Chinese history.

This is an extraordinary achievement which all of us applaud, and we should. Communism, which continues to reign in the People's Republic of China, is the antithesis of democracy. Wei Jingsheng, who was recently sentenced again to prison for his role as a democracy activist in the People's Republic, is recent testimony to how stark that difference is.

The People's Republic of China is free to maintain its Communist dictatorship. It is free to abuse human rights. It is free to in every respect, economic and political, differ from the free people on Taiwan and do all of this without military threat from the United States or anyone. In fact, we openly trade with the People's Republic of China.

But what they are not free to do, what they have no right to do, in na-

ture or in law, is to mount an unprovoked military assault against the island democracy on Taiwan.

Right now, the People's Republic of China is threatening freedom in the world because they are threatening this military invasion. The United States policy has been and shall remain that we will trust any outcome peaceably achieved through diplomatic negotiations and ongoing discussions and all other peaceful meetings between the Government on Taiwan and the Government in Beijing, the Communist Government of the People's Republic of China.

Unilateral imposition of a solution, least of all by military force, is not acceptable. In the Shanghai Communiqué, which the preceding speaker referred to, in 1982, the People's Republic of China agreed that they would seek a peaceful resolution of any disagreements they have with Taiwan. That is what everyone in the world should support.

Naked military aggression targeted against a democracy is something that everyone here should understand threatens each of us. What we want in that region is peace. What we do not want is inadvertent war.

Right now the Communist leaders in Beijing are pushing and pushing and pushing as hard as they can, competing in fact with one another, to see which of them is going to succeed to the head of that dictatorship, and they are trying to show who is the most muscular, who is the most Communist, who is the most opposed to democracy.

As they push and push and push, they must understand that there is a line beyond which they must not go, and that is launching a military assault against Taiwan. If the United States is ambiguous on this point, we risk war through weakness. We will not have war. We will have peace if we are quite clear in this aspect of our foreign policy. But there is nothing to be gained and everything to be lost from saying we are not sure what would happen if the People's Republic of China were to launch a military invasion of Taiwan, because the truth is we do know the answer to that, and we ought to tell Beijing first before it happens. The People's Republic of China is our sixth-largest trading partner. Taiwan is America's seventh-largest trading partner. Because the PRC runs a huge trade deficit with America, it is true that Taiwan actually buys more from the United States than does the Communist government in China. Because they are respectively our sixth- and seventh-largest trading partners, we have nothing to gain from a war in the Taiwan Strait.

We in America must be the peacemakers, and there is only one way for the world's only superpower to maintain peace here, and that is to be clear. We have no diplomacy that can help us once there is a war that is started on a mistaken premise that the United States will not respond. But we do have

a means—because of our relationship with both Taiwan and the People's Republic of China—have a means to keep the peace, and that is to let them know that America stands by its friendship with the peaceful government on Taiwan. Taiwan is not a threat to the PRC. The PRC, the People's Republic of China, must not be a threat to the free government on Taiwan.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

SUMMER JOBS PROGRAM CRITICAL FOR OUR YOUNG PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, there are some in this House who would want to require young people of America to bear the additional burden of being denied and deprived of a job and of a chance. These Members talk about the dilemma of teenagers, teenage pregnancy. They talk about the horror of teen violence. They talk about the plague and the scourge of drugs in our communities. Yet those same Members in the House Labor-HHS appropriation bill voted to eliminate the very program that serves to help prevent those problems, summer jobs. If those Members have their way, some 615,000 youth will not have a work experience, nor will they have educational assistance, in some 650 communities across the United States.

Recently, however, the Senate, by an overwhelming majority, some 84 to 16, Republicans and Democrats alike, voted to continue the Summer Youth Employment Program by restoring \$635 million in funds. The House should follow the Senate in this critical matter.

While funding under the Senate program obviously is at 75 percent of the level it was when George Bush was President, nevertheless our youth indeed would have jobs, and that is the critical point.

Mr. Speaker, the Summer Youth Employment Program has worked, has served youths very well since 1964. This is not a perfect program, but it is a program that should be made stronger, not necessarily ended. It has been going on for 30 years, and it has meant the difference in the lives of millions of young people.

This program does not provide charity; it provides a chance. Very often this is the first opportunity young people have to get a job, to obtain employment experience, to learn the work ethic through summer jobs programs. A job gives an individual dignity, a feeling of contributing, pride in oneself, and the resources to purchase needed goods and services. A job gives an individual worth and value.